

Remarks

Upon entry of the pending response, claims 12 and 17-23 will be pending. Claim 12 is currently amended. Claims 13-16 are canceled. Claims 17-23 are new. Reconsideration in view of the above presented amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Discussion of Claim Amendments

Claim 12 has been amended to reflect that the process is a roll-to-roll process. Support for this amendment can be found in at least original claim 1. Claim 12 has been further amended to recite that the etching takes place in an etch chamber and that the depositing of a layer of metal takes place in at least one electron beam evaporation chamber. Support for this amendment can be found on at least page 13 of the application as filed.

Claim 12 has also been amended to note that at least one layer of at least one metal is deposited on the surface of the strip. Support for this amendment can be found on page 14 of the application as filed.

Support for the remaining amendments to claim 12 can be found at least in original claim 1, original claim 2, or on page 7 of the application.

Claim 17 is new and finds support in original claim 3.

Claim 18 is new and finds support on at least page 14 of the application.

Claim 19 is new and finds support in at least original claim 4.

Claim 20 is new and finds support in at least original claim 5.

Claim 21 is new and finds support in at least original claim 6.

Claim 22 is new and finds support in at least original claim 7.

Claim 23 is new and finds support in at least original claim 8.

Response to 35 U.S.C. §102(b) Rejection

Claims 12 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. 4,999,259 to Hashimoto, *et al*, (“Hashimoto”). Applicant respectfully submits that these rejections are moot in view of the amendments to claim 12 and the cancelation of claim 14. Specifically, and as discussed above, claim 12 now recites that the etching takes place in an etch chamber and that the depositing of at least one layer of at least one metal takes place in at least one electron beam evaporation chamber.

Hashimoto appears to teach the use of a single chamber for etching and deposition. *See, e.g.*, Hashimoto examples 2 and 3. These examples do not teach or disclose the use of multiple chambers. Applicant therefore submits that Hashimoto fails to teach all of the elements of the currently pending claims. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of claims 12.

New claims 17 through 23 depend directly or indirectly from claim 12. These claims are believed to be novel in view of Hashimoto for at least the reasons set forth above.

Response to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejections

Hashimoto

Claims 12, 14, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hashimoto. Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection is moot in view of the amendments to claim 12 and the cancelation of claims 14 and 16. Specifically, there is nothing in Hashimoto that teaches or suggest the use of multiple chambers. Rather, and as discussed previously herein, Hashimoto appears to teach the use of a single chamber. Therefore, because Hashimoto does not teach or

suggest all of the elements of the presently pending claims, no *prima facie* case has been adduced. The Examiner is therefore requested to withdraw the rejection of claim 12.

New claims 17 through 23 depend directly or indirectly from claim 12 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the reasons set forth above. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to acknowledge the allowability of these claims as well.

Vyas

Claims 12 and 14-16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. 2003/0228512 to Vyas, *et al* ("Vyas"). Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection is moot in view of the amendments to claim 12 and the cancelation of claims 14-16. Specifically, and as discussed above, claim 12 now recites that the etching takes place in an etch chamber and that the depositing of at least one layer of at least one metal takes place in at least one electron beam evaporation chamber.

Vyas does not teach or suggest the use of multiple chambers as is presently claimed. Rather, Vyas teaches a nearly simultaneous etching and deposition process. *See*, e.g., claim 1 of Vyas. *See also* Vyas ¶64 which describes how the etching and deposition processes are nearly simultaneous. The rejection of claim 12 in view of Vyas is therefore believed to be moot and the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

New claims 17-23 depend directly or indirectly from claim 12. For at least the reasons set forth for claim 12, new claims 17-23 are believed to be non-obvious. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to allow these claims.

Conclusion

From the foregoing, further and favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner feel that any issues remain, it is requested that the undersigned be contacted so that any such issues may be adequately addressed and prosecution of the instant application expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

HÅKAN HOLMBERG

Dated: January 3, 2011

BY: /Matthew S. Bodenstein/
Matthew S. Bodenstein
Reg. No. 58,885
DRINKER, BIDDLE & REATH, LLP.
One Logan Square, Suite 2000
Philadelphia, PA 19103-6996
Phone: (215) 988-3385
Fax: (215) 988-2757
Attorney for Applicant